

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-22 are pending in the application and stand rejected.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8-16 and 18-22 stand rejected as being anticipated by Myers et al. (2001).

In the Amendment filed October 16, 2007, Applicants submitted:

Myers merely displays the search results in an Informedia search results window; not files to be searched. Furthermore, as disclosed in Figure 2, only a query window and a search results window are displayed. Consequently, Myers fails to disclose a media file management unit that creates a search window that displays media files to be searched.

*(Amendment of October 16, 2007).*

As emphasized in those earlier remarks, Applicants submitted Myers only discloses the results of the search in FIG. 2.

In the Response to Arguments section of this Office Action, the Examiner contends:

Informedia identifies clips of video that are relevant to the search term, and shows each clip with a representative frame. If the user makes a new query, then the search results window will be erased and the new results will appear instead. The citation reasonably supports that the files shown in Figure 2 are to be searched again when the user makes a new query.

*(Office Action, p. 2).*

Thus, the Examiner appears to take the position that the search results shown in FIG. 2 are also the media files to be searched when the user makes a new query. However, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's position because Myers fails to disclose that the search results, which are a representative frame of a video clip, are the files that are searched. Rather,

Myers performs searching on metadata that is stored in a database. In this regard, Myers provides:

For all of its video content, Informedia creates a textual transcript of the audio track using closed-captioning information and speech recognition [7]. The transcript is time-aligned with the video using CMU's Sphinx speech recognition system [27]. Informedia also performs image analysis to detect shot boundaries, extracting representative thumbnail images from each shot [6] and detects and identifies faces in the video frame. A video OCR systems identifies and recognizes captions in the image [28]. Certain kinds of camera movements such as pans and fades can also be identified. All of this metadata about the video is stored in a database. This metadata is used by Informedia . . . to provide searching for query terms and visualization of the results.

(Myers, p. 109, section titled “4. INFORMEDIA”).

Thus, Applicants submit the video frames shown in FIG. 2 are not files to be searched. Rather, Myers fails to disclose that any video files are searched. Rather, Myers creates a database of metadata, which is searched to locate video files in response to a query. Furthermore, because Myers fails to disclose that this metadata, or any multimedia files containing this metadata are displayed, Applicants submit Myers fails to disclose, “a media file management unit that creates a search window that displays media files to be searched,” as recited in claim 1.

Additionally, Applicants submit Myers also fails to disclose “an interface unit that accesses media files stored in another information appliance by the control signal, and receives the media files,” as recited in claim 1.

Thus, Applicants submit claim 1 is allowable for at least this reason. Additionally, because claims 12 and 20 recite a similar feature, Applicants submit these claims are allowable

for at least the same reasons set forth above. Additionally, Applicants submit claims 2-3, 5-6, 8-11, 13-16, 18-19 and 21-22 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependency.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claim 4 stands rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Myers as applied to claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-16 and 18-22 above, and in further view of Chernock et al. (US 6,229,524).

Applicants submit that because Chernock, either taken alone or in combination with Myers, fails to compensate for the above noted deficiencies of Myers as applied to claim 1, claim 4 is allowable, at least by virtue of its dependency.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 7 and 17 stand rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Myers as applied to claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-16 and 18-22.

In particular, the Examiner concedes Myers fails to disclose displaying paths of the media files in the edit or search windows. However, the Examiner alleges that Myers suggests a plan to add support for any other views that might be useful. Thus, the Examiner contends that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to add WWW links (paths).

In response, Applicants submit that because the Examiner's alleged modification, either taken alone or in combination with Myers, fails to compensate for the above noted deficiencies of Myers as applied to claim 1, claims 7 and 17 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependency.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the


AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)  
U.S. Application No.: 10/647,300

Attorney Docket No.: Q76059

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



\_\_\_\_\_  
David P. Emery  
Registration No. 55,154

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE  
23373  
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: March 27, 2008